

# FOLIO



THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA STAFF BULLETIN

EDMONTON 7, ALBERTA



## Increased student representation

*The Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Representation on the General Faculties Council has been received by the Executive Committee of the General Faculties Council, as well as the minority report of D. T. ANDERSON, Associate Professor of Law, a member of the committee. Excerpts from The Universities Act regarding representation on General Faculties Council are reprinted.*

*The Report is to be the sole item on the agenda of a special meeting of General Faculties Council to be held during the week of February 1, 1971. Submissions should be sent to JOHN NICOL, Secretary to the General Faculties Council, by January 15, 1971.*

*The reports and the excerpts from the Act appear below.*

### Report of the Committee

At its meeting of June 4, 1969, the General Faculty Council, (now the General Faculties Council), agreed to set up an ad hoc Committee to bring forward recommendations concerning increased student representation on the General Faculties Council and its committees. In September 1969 the Committee was constituted with the following membership: MAX WYMAN, President of the University (Chairman of the Committee); H. T. COUTTS, Dean of Education; D. T. ANDERSON, Associate Professor of Law; J. J. DELEHANTY, Associate Professor of Economics; MISS E. LAW and D. LEADBEATER, Students' Union representatives; R. A. WATSON, Graduate Students' Association representative.

The Committee met formally six times between October 1969, and August 1970. The views of the Non-Academic Staff Association were presented at the third meeting by a deputation consisting of P. ARNOLD, R. M. SCOTT and O. WOOD. Before the fifth meeting in April, the Students' Union decided to withdraw its members from the Committee, and the Committee agreed to G. KUSCHMINDER acting as an observer. A sixth meeting, in August, 1970, was held to hear a delegation of students, including Z. MELKVI and O. GRAINGER (Graduate Students' Association), and G. KUSCHMINDER, J. PEACH, D. HENDRICKSON, and T. CHRISTIAN (Students' Union).

### PROCEDURES AND ASSUMPTIONS

Early in its deliberations, the Committee decided upon the following procedures.

(1) It would consider the composition of General Faculties Council itself, and attempt to establish certain general principles, before turning to the question of student participation in Council committees.

(2) In discussing the composition of the Council, it would first attempt to state principles by means of which a composition of the Council could be determined.

(3) It would then attempt to show how this composition could be implemented within the terms of the existing Universities Act.

(4) It would leave any consideration of changes in The Universities Act to General Faculties Council as outside the Committee's terms of reference.

The Committee also made the following basic assumptions.

(1) Students are a constituent part of the University and not mere clients of it.

(2) Implicit in the Committee's terms of reference is a desire on the part of the present Council to give students more "meaningful" representation.

(3) By more "meaningful" representation would be meant representation that made possible a wide coverage of student viewpoints and a greater voting weight.

### BACKGROUND

With the proclamation of The Universities Act of 1966, changes took place in the governing structures of the universities in Alberta. In the first place, although the concept of a Board of Governors as an ultimate authority was retained, the wide powers of delegation of authority given to the

Board of Governors, and its actual use of these powers of delegation, resulted in the General Faculties Council becoming the major decision-making body within the University structure. In the second place, the reconstitution of the General Faculties Council to ensure a two to one ratio between elected members of the academic staff and administration officers reflected the philosophy of 1966, that the academic staff was the University. In this connection, it is interesting to recall that the major argument for the present composition of the General Faculties Council was the "democratization" of the University.

In the opinion of the Committee, the philosophy mentioned above is no longer generally acceptable, and certainly the present governing structure of the University does not approximate the ideas of students concerning a "democratic" university.

Although student representation on the General Faculties Council came into existence with the proclamation of The Universities Act of 1966, a membership of three students among a total membership of 79 must be considered as a token representation, without the authority or voting strength to influence the important decisions the General Faculties Council must make.

A great deal has been written recently, both pro and con, about student participation in the governing bodies of universities, most of it pure rhetoric or polemic with little or no evidence on the basis of which the validity of the statements could be tested. There is, however, considerable evidence to support the belief that a move towards a "meaningful" student representation on the governing bodies of universities is inevitable and imminent.

During the past year, indeed, many proposals have been advanced to change the governing structures of universities to give a meaningful voice to students, and some of them have already been adopted. For example, the University of Toronto has recommended a radical change in the Universities Act of Ontario to provide for a widely representative and unicameral governing body.

Of the eleven proposals considered by the University of Toronto, the proposal recommended, and the second choice, are outlined below.

Constituents	Recommended	Second Choice
Faculty	21	18
Students	14	18
Public	14	10
Alumni	10	10
Support staff	6	7
President	1	1
President's appointees	3	4
Academic administrators	3	
Total	72	68

An example of a university with a governing body made up entirely of staff and students is provided by the University of New Haven, whose major decision-making group now consists of the following:

Constituents	Numbers
Academic staff (elected)	30
Students (elected)	30
Administration officers	12
Total	72

For purposes of comparison, the present composition of General Faculties Council of The University of Alberta is given in Table 1.

Clearly the elected members of the academic staff hold a working majority of the membership in General Faculties Council, and, as mentioned before, this is in accord with the fundamental concept involved in the definition of a "democratic" university as of 1966. Since that time, the need to redefine this term seems to have been generally conceded, and the Committee accordingly places before the Council for its consideration the following recommendations as to guiding principles, composition of membership, and election of members.

#### RECOMMENDED GUIDING PRINCIPLES

(1) As long as the two-tiered governing structure exists at The University of Alberta, the membership on General Faculties Council should come from within the University community.

(2) With the wide powers which have been delegated to it by the Board of Governors, the Council should continue to be the major decision-making body within the University structure.

(3) Every Council member is charged with the responsibility of examining issues before the Council and voting as he or she judges fit on such issues. No member, no matter how he or she gains membership on this Council, is an instructed delegate, and no member can be impeached.

(4) Although the Committee feels that the possibility is remote that any issue will ever arise which will polarize one group within the University against another, the following constituent groups should be recognized as having independent claims for membership on GFC: academic staff, undergraduate students, graduate students, non-academic staff, administrative officers, Association of the Academic Staff of The University of Alberta, Students' Union, Graduate Students' Association, and Non-Academic Staff Association.

(5) The importance of the academic staff to this University should be recognized by ensuring that no other constituent group has a membership on General Faculties Council larger than that assigned to the academic staff.

(6) No constituent group should be large enough to carry a vote without the support of a "substantial" number of members of other constituent groups. (What the Committee considers to be a "substantial" number is explained below.)

(7) The number of ex-officio members of the Council is determined by The Universities Act to be 24, and the number of members of the Academic Staff to be at least 48. This latter number should remain at 48 (exclusive of the one member of the academic staff named by the AASUA).

(8) Staff and student associations should name representatives to General Faculties Council as follows:

Constituents	Numbers
AASUA	1
Students' Union	2*
Graduate Students' Association	1*
Non-Academic Staff Association	1
Total	5

\*Currently required by The Universities Act.

(9) The Non-Academic Staff Association agrees with the Committee that the non-academic staff of the University should elect two members at large to General Faculties Council. (There is, however, a disagreement between the Non-Academic Staff Association and the Committee on the method of electing these members. The Committee would give the franchise to all members of the non-academic staff; the NASA would restrict it to its own membership.)

(10) Student members of the Council should be elected on a basis that is proportional to the number of students registered in the various faculties and schools.

(11) A quorum for the Council should be one-third of the total membership.

#### Notes

(1) In attempting to determine what might be deemed a "substantial" number under Principle 6 above, the Committee reasoned as follows.

(a) If the non-academic staff were granted three statutory places on the Council, the total membership would rise to 81, of whom 49 would be members of the academic staff constituent group. This would give that group an absolute voting majority. To prevent this happening, it would be necessary to raise the total membership to at least 99, an increase of 18. If the 18 places were to be assigned to students, their membership would rise to 21, but the academic staff constituent group would theoretically still need only one vote from another group to carry a motion. One vote cannot be considered a "substantial" number.

(b) The largest number of places that could be assigned to students would be 46, raising their total to 49, or parity with that of the academic staff (See Principle 5 above).

The membership of General Faculties Council would then be 127. Under such circumstances, either group would theoretically require 15 votes (or about 20 per cent of the remaining voting strength of the Council) from other constituent groups to carry a motion. The Committee would call such a percentage "substantial," and would recommend its adoption.

(2) The Committee recommends the raising of the representation of the student constituent group to parity with that of the academic staff rather than to some arbitrary figure between 21 and 49 for the reasons advanced above, but also to make "reasonable" representation possible. It is felt that there should be one graduate student representative for each of the faculty areas where a considerable amount of graduate work is conducted, and proportional representation of members of the Students' Union across the various faculties and schools, with none having less than one representative.

## FOLIO

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Published for the staff and other interested persons by the University Publications Office Copyright 1970.

William Samis, *Editor*

*Advisory Committee:* E. D. Hodgson (*Acting Associate Dean of Graduate Studies*), J. W. Carmichael (*Professor of Bacteriology*), and Aylmer A. Ryan (*Provost and Executive Assistant to the President*)

*Staff:* Katherine Govier (*Assistant Editor*), Jeanette Rothrock (*Senior Writer*), Forrest Bard (*Photographer*), Frank Hale (*Illustrator*), and Norma Gutteridge (*Copy Editor*)

**EDITORIAL OFFICE:** University Publications Office, 123 Administration Building, telephone 432-4991

**DISTRIBUTION** and mailing list enquiries Public Relations Office (Attention Mrs. B. J. Lacroix), telephone 432-4201

Printed by the Printing Department  
Photographic lab work by Technical Services

### RECOMMENDED COMPOSITION OF THE GENERAL FACULTIES COUNCIL

The recommended composition of the expanded General Faculties Council is shown in Table 2.

### RECOMMENDED METHOD OF ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE GENERAL FACULTIES COUNCIL

The Committee feels that a faculty or school is the smallest unit with which an undergraduate student can normally be identified. On this basis, the following recommendations are made:

(1) The distribution of 36 undergraduate student members among the faculties and schools should be determined on a basis that is proportionate to the number of full-time students in that faculty or school, with the proviso that each faculty or school should always have at least one member on the Council.

(2) Every student who is registered in a particular faculty or school, and who is a member of the Students' Union, should be eligible to vote in the election of undergraduate student members of General Faculties Council for that faculty or school.

(3) The election of undergraduate student members of General Faculties Council should be conducted by the Students' Union.

(4) Every graduate student whose work is connected with a department in a particular faculty or school is eligible to vote in the election of the graduate student member of the Council for that faculty or school.

(5) The election of graduate student members of the Council should be conducted by the Graduate Students' Association.

#### Notes

(1) It should be noted that the Students' Union made a suggestion to the Committee that all members of the Council of the Students' Union should also be members of General Faculties Council. Although this would cause no difficulty with respect to numbers because there happen to be 36 members of the Council, the Committee feels that this would not be a wise principle to adopt. The Committee believes that the student body should be free to elect any student of their choice to membership on General Faculties Council, and an obligation to serve also on the Council of the Students' Union should not be imposed on students interested in the work of General Faculties Council. If students are interested in such a two-fold obligation, they should be free to run in the election for both positions.

(2) The Committee was also aware of the possible disadvantages inherent in a much enlarged General Faculties Council, but felt that other considerations, including urgency, outweighed them at this time.

TABLE 1  
PRESENT COMPOSITION OF THE GENERAL FACULTIES COUNCIL

Constituents	Numbers
Ex officio administration officers	24
Academic staff elected by faculties	48
Students named by the Students' Union	2
Students named by the Graduate Students' Association	1
Staff member named by the Academic Staff Association	1
Provost	1
Representative of Summer Session and Evening Credit Program	1
Representative of Non-Academic Staff Association	3
Representative of the Board of Governors	1
Total	82

TABLE 2  
RECOMMENDED COMPOSITION OF THE GENERAL FACULTIES COUNCIL

	Ex-officio	Elected	Appointed	Under-graduate students	Graduate students	Non-academic staff
Agriculture	1	3		1	1	
Arts	1	13		6	1	
Business Administration and Commerce	1	1		2	1	
Dentistry	1	1		1	1	
Dental Hygiene	1			1		
Education	1	6		8	1	
Engineering	1	3		3	1	
Extension	1					
Graduate Studies	1					
Household Economics	1	1		1		
Law	1	1		1		
Library Science	1			1		
Library	1					
Medicine	1	5		1	1	
Nursing	1	1		1		
Pharmacy	1	1		1	1	
Physical Education	1	1		1	1	
Rehabilitation Medicine	1	1		1		
Science	1	10		6	1	
President's Office	4					
Registrar		1				
Summer Session and Evening Credit Program				1		
Students' Union				2		
Graduate Students' Association				1		
Association of the Academic Staff				1		
Non-Academic Staff Association				1		
Provost				1		
Non-academic staff						2
Sub-total	24	48	7	36	10	2
Total						127

## Minority Report

D. T. ANDERSON, Associate Professor of Law, regrets that he has been unable to agree with either the procedures or the recommendations of his colleagues on the Committee (hereinafter called "the majority"). His own views are set forth in the following report as briefly as the complexity of the subject will allow. This report is largely confined to the principal recommendation of the majority, i.e., that students and faculty have equal representation on General Faculties Council.

### OBJECTIONS TO PROCEDURES FOLLOWED BY THE COMMITTEE

The Committee was instructed "to present recommendations concerning increased student representation on General Faculty Council and its committees."

1. The proper procedures, it is submitted, would have included thorough inquiry to find out relevant facts and to assess the experience of student representation on General Faculties Council and its committees in recent years. There should have been a study of the purposes and functions of General Faculties Council and its committees, with a view to ascertaining the need and value, in different circumstances, of student participation. The question of the efficiency of the Council, and the effect on efficiency of increased size and more rapidly changing membership, should have been fully considered. Students and other members of Council and its committees, on which students have been represented, should have been asked a number of questions: Were student members thought representative of student opinion? What was the average duration of membership? Were they faithful in attendance, and able to participate when required during vacation periods? Did they make an effective and useful contribution? Did students show independent judgment and an ability, when necessary, to respect confidences? What differences, if any, were there between graduate and undergraduate students? To frame these questions is not to imply that the answers would have been unfavorable to the students, nor that the answers by themselves would have provided a sufficient basis for either justifying or discrediting any enlargement of student participation in University government; however, the facts thus elicited would surely be material to the question in issue.

The Committee should also have investigated the problems that arose this past session, particularly with respect to the unhappily named "Law and Order" committee and the withdrawal of students from General

Faculties Council and various of its committees at the behest of the Students' Union Council, with a view to understanding student attitudes and exploring the questions about responsibility and maturity that many observers believe were raised by these incidents.

There should also have been a study of the feasibility of increasing student representation: the workload of the members of the Council and its various committees, the experience of committees with resignations and absences, the difficulties in filling positions that may have been encountered by the Students' Union Personnel Board, all ought to have been considered.

The Committee should have investigated thoroughly the experience of other universities. In so doing, full account should have been taken of differences of circumstances (for example, in some universities the different faculties and schools are more independent of central control than they are in Alberta) and the length of the other institutions' experience. (Neither of the proposals for re-organization of the government of the University of Toronto, mentioned by the report, has been implemented, and therefore prove nothing as to the value and effect of the changes.)

It might also have been well, before releasing the report, to consult with the other Alberta universities, which are subject to the same Universities Act and will inevitably be affected by any major change made here.

The Committee did not do these things. It considered only the composition of General Faculties Council, and formed its recommendations in that regard without proper inquiry into relevant facts. It might be said that the broad issue was decided as a matter of principle, except that the majority did not in fact fully address itself to questions of principle in either its deliberations or its report.

2. In view of the extreme character of the recommendations, and their extensive ramifications, the "urgency" alleged by the majority in Note (2) at the end of their report does not justify this failure to examine fully the facts and issues; nor does it compel the Council to act with undue haste in considering the report.

■ **IT IS SUBMITTED that the recommendations of the majority, and any decisions thereon, are premature until relevant facts are gathered and assessed.**

### NATURE, IMPLICATIONS, AND IMPORTANCE OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES

(1) The proposal made by the majority of the Committee goes far beyond an enlargement of the number of students on the Council

to meet functional requirements or to increase the range of student opinion represented. In effect, it would create parity between student members and members elected by the faculty. By clear implication, it is based on an assumed equality between faculty and students in their capacity to determine the academic policy and standards of the University.

(One consequence which should be noted and studied by the AASUA is that administrative officers and student members could, on particular issues on which their views coincided, combine to compel adoption by the teaching members of the University of academic standards, policies or practices which the latter, in their experience and judgment, thought unwise or improper.)

(2) An important fact to be emphasized at the outset and borne in mind throughout the discussion of the majority report is the statutory and de facto power of General Faculties Council. Subject to a control of the Board (that is, in fact, not directly or regularly exercised) the Council "is responsible for the academic affairs of the University." Specifically, it may determine courses of study, methods and standards of examination, and entrance requirements of the University, and may hear and determine appeals from the decisions of faculty councils in all sorts of matters. *In theory*, it could require engineers to take instruction in French, insist on a Marxist content in lectures, discontinue the teaching of classics, require all faculties to give full academic credit for extra-curricular activities, compel the medical school to teach acupuncture, or direct the law faculty to certify as qualified in law an incompetent who could not be relied on to carry a document across the street.

Of course, it is not necessary to parade such perverse and fanciful horrors to make the point. The introduction of the stanine system and the discussion or mention in General Faculties Council this past year of compulsory physical education, the keeping of student files, the abolition of supplements and the introduction of a "pass-fail" grading system illustrate how the Council, in the exercise of its broad powers, may by general legislation impose on all faculties policies that various faculties, for their own good reasons, regard as inappropriate or unwise. (This is of particular concern to the professional faculties, which, by reason of their small size, find their material interest insufficiently represented on the Council, which is composed on a modified "rep by pop" basis, but may affect all faculties, large or small. The "under-representation" of professional faculties, incidentally, will be accentuated by the proposed enlargement of the Council.)

It must be noted that General Faculties Council can exercise any power of a faculty council that it thinks desirable to exercise.

Considering the amplitude of the Council's authority, it is perhaps remarkable that the composition of the Council is not fully prescribed by statute, rather than left, within broad outlines, to the Council itself in the exercise of its appointing power. Presumably the Legislature did not wish to settle the matter finally in an Act that was passed when University government was taking a new form and that had to apply to the various circumstances of all provincial universities. However, it is clear, in light of the scope of the power of the Council, that any such drastic change as that proposed by the majority must be fully justified by its proponents.

(3) There are important wider implications, not considered by the majority report:

(a) It would not be unreasonable to predict that a General Faculties Council which contained student members in numbers equal to elected faculty members would exert strong pressures on all faculty and school councils to grant parity, or something near it, to students and to give students equal voting rights on faculty committees dealing with the appointments, promotions, and such other matters. *Herein, it is submitted, lies the real implication and risk of the majority's proposal. Faculty councils consider academic issues that, it is submitted, should be resolved by academic staff.* Moreover, in larger faculties, there will be some of the same problems of efficiency and organization that will confront the Council.

(b) To the extent that the Council, because of its size and more rapidly changing membership, is made less effective, there will be an increase in the independent power of the president and administration. In this respect, the proposal is "undemocratic" in character. (See below.)

(c) Serious questions are raised as to the enforced membership of the Students' Council. (See below.)

(d) As noted, in the vastly enlarged General Faculties Council that is proposed, the voice of the smaller faculties and schools will be diminished.

■ *IT IS SUBMITTED that the onus of justifying change lies on those who propose it, and that the more drastic is the change, the heavier is their burden; and that in their report the majority have failed to discharge that onus, not having presented reasons cogent enough to support their extreme recommendations.*

#### THREE IRRELEVANT OR UNWORTHY ARGUMENTS TO BE DISREGARDED

Those who propose that students have parity or substantial voting membership in the

governing bodies of a university often pray in aid three arguments (often presented as axioms or dogmas not to be questioned): that it is required by the "democratic" nature of the university; that it is in any event inevitable; that it is justified as an "educational experience."

One of these is suggested in the majority report, and another is referred to.

■ *IT IS SUBMITTED that these three so-called "reasons" will not withstand critical scrutiny; they are wrong, irrelevant, or inadequate, and should not be allowed to influence the determination of the important policy that is in issue.*

(1) The argument from the alleged "democratic" character of the university is considered more fully below. It may here be noted only that there is no self-evident reason to *assume* there is a valid analogy between a university and a fully democratic political society. As one writer, ANTHONY FLEW, has said (*Solon*, October 1969), "Surely, again, there is a far closer analogy with a specialist club or professional body which may, without offence to any democratic principles, require certain qualifications for full voting membership?"

(2) One trusts it will be generally accepted in a university community that changes will not be made, without regard to fundamental principles or practical requirements, merely because they are vaguely felt to be 'inevitable.' Unfortunately, some variant of this theme is often to be found expressed, or barely concealed between the lines, in statements by various faculty members of modern universities who advocate or weakly acquiesce against their better judgment in radical reconstitution of university government. One robust answer to such an attitude has been given by ANTHONY FLEW (*Solon*, October 1969):

"In many places, concessions are being devised in order to meet or anticipate pressures . . . and even the felt need to be in the fashionable swing with the Sunday supplements. Such concessions are then sold to the waverers as really only little ones; as inevitable; as moving with the times; and so on—through the whole litany. . . Yet to act in this way is both shortsighted and, in the most literal sense, unprincipled. The inevitable, as Sir Isaiah Berlin warns us, is too frequently that which is not resisted with determination. Moving with, and adjustment to the times, was—it should be remembered more often—the discreditable glory of the Vicar of Bray. The shortsightedness lies in the simple fact that any steps taken without regard to principle are likely later to be construed as an admission of what was once so conveniently and so comfortably ignored."

The concern of General Faculties Council will, of course, be to do what is right, not merely that which may be represented as expedient, and it will address itself to fundamental principles, knowing that what is unsound in principle is not likely in the long haul, to be good in fact. No reasonable member of the administration and Council will yield to temptation to purchase temporary peace or popularity with any segment of the University population at the cost of the best interests of the University; those who are now in authority must not prodigally sign IOU's to the future, which their successors may have to redeem at great cost.

Indeed, it is to be questioned whether the pressures for parity are in truth as great as they are represented to be. The real concern of the students is for improvement of their education and for the opportunity to have their views truly considered. The public look to the universities to maintain high standards of teaching and scholarship, to preserve academic freedom, and to administer responsibly and efficiently the enormous resources entrusted to them, and expect those governing universities to bring to bear on the development of institutions the same qualities of analysis, objectivity, and thoroughness that characterize good scholarship.

(3) Another argument in favor of student participation, with full rights, in governing councils is that the students thus admitted gain a valuable education in reasoned argument and in "the democratic process." There is, of course, some truth in this claim, but it is certainly not by itself an adequate justification for giving students representation on governing bodies, let alone parity of representation. In the first place, participation in university government is not of unique educational value: similar experience may be gained in the Students' Union and other bodies, and it may well be suggested even then that no such experience would equal, for educational purposes, proper study of constitutional history and public administration. Second, the educational value would seem to be less in the decision-making procedure than in the opportunity to become familiar with a range of academic problems and issues; these opportunities may be available under a variety of forms of student participation in university affairs other than voting membership in government bodies, and indeed are now open to any student who cares to examine such matters. (In truth, it may be questioned how far the university should indulge the almost narcissistic tendency of many students to devote attention to

occasionally petty internal university matters at the expense of the more substantial and important subject-matter of their own studies and of wider social problems.) Third, whatever educational value service on Council might have, it could only be offered to a few students each year, and obviously this would not justify completely transforming the composition of General Faculties Council. Fourth, and most important, even if it were conceded that service on Council had an educational value for student members and other students, the critical question is their fitness for the work and the value to university government of their participation in this form, matters discussed below.

#### OBJECTIONS IN PRINCIPLE TO THE MAJORITY REPORT

- IT IS SUBMITTED that the report of the majority, so far as it makes explicit the reasons for its recommendations,
  - (1) blurs important distinctions between
    - (a) academic and non-academic matters;
    - (b) those who teach and those who are taught;
    - (c) consultation and communication, on the one hand, and, on the other, decision and final authority;
  - (2) effectively if not directly lends support to a view based on a misapprehension and misapplication of "the democratic principle"
  - (3) fails to provide the most effective means for valuable student opinion to influence University policy;
  - (4) by implication, both minimizes the effectiveness of current student representation and assumes a separation and antagonism between the views of faculty and the views of students on matters of common concern that does not in fact exist; and
  - (5) is insensitive to very real problems of conflict-of-interest inherent in its proposals.

##### (1) The majority report blurs important and necessary distinctions

###### (a) between academic and non-academic matters

Any discussion of student participation in management of the University will be disorderly, it is suggested, if no distinction is preserved between academic and non-academic matters. (That the distinction is—or, more accurately, the "set of distinctions" are—difficult to draw in particular marginal cases which may come within the broad jurisdiction of the Council, or that in a wide sense all matters that may affect students' performance may arguably be described as ultimately academic, does not vitiate the point; the same may be said of many important conditions and categories and their respective opposites.)

In many matters today students have demonstrated great competence, and there are many matters with which they are well-equipped to deal, either alone or as co-equal or even majority members of the appropriate body: food services; the provision of accommodation; the organization and conduct of a wide range of sporting and other extra-curricular activities. This fact has been recognized by The University of Alberta in the structure of a number of committees, which have worked quite well, despite the evident difficulties arising from the fact that students' terms of office are short. There will and ought to be more extensive delegation of responsibilities to students in many areas, ranging from housing to discipline, where (as the Oxford Report of the Committee on Relations with Junior Members, hereinafter called the "Hart Report" puts it), "... 'people are involved as people' and the inequality of senior and junior members is relatively insignificant" as students continue to develop and demonstrate their competence in legislation and management. Such a development may be seen to be in keeping with social change and the interest of both students and the university. Students no longer accept automatically and uncritically the authority of their teachers in matters outside the academic sphere; and universities, in an age when education is prolonged to increasingly great lengths, have neither the desire nor the ability to keep their students in a state of complete tutelage.

However, it does not follow that students should have equivalent responsibilities for the academic policies that are within the province of the General Faculties Council and the faculty councils. The lesson, to quote again from the Hart Report, is that the university should modify older patterns of authority "by sharing responsibilities where inequalities of knowledge, experience, and continuity are not important factors, and by providing channels for critical discussion and argument where they are;" not that the distinctions between these two kinds of cases should be fudged.

###### (b) between students and academic staff

In its evident presumption of equality between students and faculty, the majority report confounds important differences between the academic staff and the student body that are directly material to the issue.

The most obvious point (trite, indeed, but so often overlooked in recent discussions) is that students do not have the same learning and experience, in education, university governance, and the subject matter of the academic disciplines, as members of the faculty. As the Hart Report observed,

"An undergraduate begins to acquire an experience of the courses and facilities

available at the University as soon as he arrives here, and he is quite soon in the position of being able to make useful criticisms of the present situation. But he has no experience of the problems of teaching as they apply to the teacher; he is relatively ignorant of the general field of study to which his syllabus is related; and until he takes his first degree, he has little experience, if any, of research . . . . The important consideration is that Senior Members making proposals and reaching decisions about teaching and research are able to draw on an experience of both activities, and they may also have experience as administrators in those fields. There are qualifications which the University may reasonably require in those to whom it entrusts academic authority." These remarks are particularly significant in view of the likelihood that a General Faculties Council, altered according to the majority proposals, would demand a similar reconstitution of school and faculty councils.

The second important point of difference is the transience of students. Members serving on General Faculties Council, faculty councils, or committees for short periods (one academic year or so) would not be able to make the same contribution as members continuing in office for several years. The turn-over assumes particular significance in the light of two facts about University government. *First*, important academic policies often take a long period of inquiry and discussion to take shape, sometimes lasting more than a year. *Second*, many decisions made by General Faculties Council and faculty councils have long-term consequences or are related to long-term plans: a Council decision on a particular academic program may have to be made in light of a general policy on the balance between teaching and research; the immediate appointments policy of a faculty may be determined by longer-range academic development plans. There is in fact practically no academic question of interest to students that does not have both immediate and more long-term aspects that require consideration. This leads to a further point, which should not be overstated, but must be mentioned: while there is no reason to question the sincere concern for the welfare of the University that would be held by most students elected to University councils or committees, it is not unreasonable to assume that generally academic staff will feel a deeper and more lasting commitment to the institution or, at least, will be conscious that they will have to live with the continuing results of their decisions and accordingly will have a particular sense of responsibility. On these considerations, it may then be suggested

that students do not have the same capacity as academic staff to contribute effectively to the work of councils and committees. The important related conclusion is that an extensive and rapidly-changing student component of any policy-making body may disturb continuity; it is suggested below that this is probable, and that the effects would be unfortunate.

To state that students cannot make the same contribution as faculty members to university councils or even to contend that students lack the necessary qualifications to be members of such bodies, is not to deny that students can make a valuable and effective contribution to the making and administration of policy in academic matters. They are, if the somewhat unhappy simile will be forgiven, all too often the forgotten toads beneath the university harrow. Their comments on academic and other matters require to be considered; their questions about university policy deserve frank and reasoned answers; and it is only by such exchanges that the university can truly be kept alive and effective. This leads to the next point.

**(c) between consulting and deciding**

The worst and most harmful confusion in the majority report is between consultation and decision, between making representations to bodies and having representatives on them.

There is no doubt that in the large modern university, there tends to develop an unfortunate gulf between students and faculty. Student opinion on matters important to the student is not obtained or properly considered. The student's assessment of his educational experience, partial though it may sometimes be, is not taken into account or even solicited. The faculty, immersed in research or entangled in committees, may fail to honor their important teaching duties. The student is left frustrated, with a feeling he cannot influence policies or practices he sees to be wrong or even obtain a reasoned explanation of them.

It should now be beyond dispute that students should be entitled to have their views and representations about academic matters given genuine and thorough consideration by those in authority in the university. This claim is not based on any fiction that the student is equal in all respects to members of the academic staff, but on respect for the student as an individual. It may be said, further, that it is the interest and the duty of the university to make the considerable effort this requires. It is in the *interest* of the university for several reasons. One, and the least worthy, is that it will allay discontent. More important

is the general value to the authorities of learning what those directly affected by their decisions think of the character, quality, and effectiveness of their education. Such information is essential to critical review and reform; the expression of such views is a spur to improvement, and a safeguard against complacency and inertia. There is another aspect to the matter: students, though they may sometimes oversimplify complex matters, tend to view questions in their moral dimension; there are many instances, historically, where the wholesome indignation of students has prevented or exposed injustices or inefficiencies in university administration in which tired or timid senior members of the university acquiesced. It is also the *duty* of university authorities to consider seriously criticisms and suggestions for improvement (reserving the liberty to reject them, on reasoned grounds), to explain their policies and practices and to modify their aims and methods when proved indefensible or undesirable. The true basis of this duty is put well by the Hart Report:

"The main justification for requiring these efforts is not merely that it will assuage or prevent the growth of the disheartening belief that students' views are of no interest to their seniors; nor even that it will improve the quality of education; it is rather that authority divorced from such readiness to give reasons to those over whom it is exercised and to attend to their arguments is a foreign element in a university whose whole educational policy is designed to foster critical and rational discussion."

To remedy existing defects in, and to improve, the channels of communication between university governing councils, teachers, and students, is a never-ending task of enormous complexity requiring great and sustained effort. The question is how best this is to be done. *It has been submitted* that the entitlement of the student to representation of his views does not automatically lead to the conclusion that students should have voting membership in university councils; even conceding the many imperfections of members of the academic staff in judgment and sensitivity in forming policy, there is no reason to disregard what the Hart Report calls the "teacher's qualifications of knowledge, experience, continuity, and professional concern" that qualify him for a place in university government. (Indeed, it would be peculiar if members of the University who promoted a reform of The Universities Act to vest more authority in a representative academic senate, on the grounds that it would be composed of specially qualified and

professionally committed members, should now support admitting to membership on equal terms persons not meeting those requirements!). *It will be further argued* below that student membership of General Faculties Council, faculty councils, and their committees, will not in any case be a sufficient solution to the real problems of communication and representation which the University must seek to resolve.

**(2) The majority report gives support to those who misapprehend and misapply "the 'Democratic' Principle."**

[The majority report mentions this argument, but really does not discuss it. Accordingly, the following remarks are directed generally against this sort of argument, rather than specifically to the use made of it by the majority.]

At this point, one peculiar and fallacious argument sometimes put forward in support of student voting representation and parity, briefly mentioned above, may be discussed. It is the claim that the "democratic" character of the university requires equality of students and faculty on governing bodies of the university. It is hard to find any clear statement of this view, but it is often heard in a muddled form. (One would think the logical extension of this argument might require parity of representation by the non-academic staff; but even most of its proponents balk at so egregious a confusion of academic and non-academic matters and qualifications.)

(The "democratic" argument is also sometimes advanced with dubious motive by extremists who merely use it as a tool to gain and exercise power; indeed, one test of the *bona fides* of those who participate in these discussions of university government may be their willingness to work on effective solutions to the real problems of student participation, rather than merely parrot claptrap slogans about "power" and "democracy." Any claim for "power" as such, made without regard to the real interests of the students, must, of course, be resisted.)

A great deal could be written in an effort to formulate any intelligible statement of the claim based on alleged "democratic" principles and to consider it in detail. For present purposes, it is suggested that the outline of a complete and persuasive answer may be found in the following passages from the Hart Report:

"We turn now to consider various formulations of the case for student participation in the government of universities. Some of these invoke democratic principles and, in so doing, seem to us to beg some

very large questions concerning academic authority and the relevance of such principles to it. We are convinced that such questions should not be begged in this way, and there is a need for a clear statement of the character of academic authority which distinguishes between its defensive forms and unnecessary or obscurantist accretions. Our view is as follows. We conceive that it is quite wrong to approach questions of academic authority with the assumption that a university either is or should be a microcosm of society at large, and then to draw the conclusion that, in a democratic country where students are acknowledged as entitled to the legal and political rights of adults, they have a right to share in the government of a university in all its aspects and so to be represented on all its decision-making bodies on at least an equal footing with teachers. We think that this general argument from the democratic character of society rests on an undefended and indeed indefensible assumption that a university has no special purposes or functions and no special problems to confront, which should differentiate its academic decision-making processes from those of society at large. The position of a university is in fact a complex one: it is partly in and partly out of the surrounding society; it is dependent upon external support but also free in many areas of decision from external interference; some of the issues that have to be decided by its decision-making bodies require the special skills, knowledge, experience, and the continuing responsibilities of the professional teacher, while others do not—or do so only to a small extent.

"We agree that there are aspects of university life where students should participate in strength on decision-making bodies, . . . None the less a university has as its distinctive purposes the advancement of knowledge and teaching, conceived not as the mere transmission of knowledge, but as the development of powers of criticism and judgment and the adjustment of the vitalizing inter-play between research and teaching. In our view, no theory of legal and political rights for the conduct of a society as a whole, not even democratic theory, is transferable to the government of these distinctively academic activities. Since there are these distinctive purposes to be pursued, it is, we believe, plain that teachers equipped by skill, knowledge and experience, training, and continuing professional association with a university should have final authority as to the manner in which they are pursued. We think that the contrary view can only be held

by those who ignore the complexity of the truth and the extent to which its attainment is dependent on experience, accumulated knowledge, and organization . . . we draw attention to the specific ways in which the fact that students are relatively inexperienced at least till late in their career and are transient members of the university, whereas decisions on academic issues have long-term consequences, constitute reasons for rejecting a democratic distribution of responsibility for academic policy between senior and junior members."

**(3) The majority report fails to consider how best to secure effective student participation in academic decision making**

Perhaps the first point to be made is that effective solutions to the problems of communication and representation are not to be found in institutional devices alone. More frequent consultations by professors with individual students, increased informal contacts, greater accessibility to students of deans and administrative officers, reviews of examinations, and so on, are also needed. Time, effort, and initiative are required of individual staff members. The University as an institution, cannot do these things. It can, however, facilitate them, in many ways: by vesting necessary decision-making powers in faculties and departments; taking these obligations into account when determining teaching loads; designing buildings properly to provide proper space for discussions in faculty offices and outside classrooms; locating coffee rooms nearer to lecture rooms; perhaps providing funds to faculty and school societies. (Perhaps one very simple contribution would be to increase the length of time between classes.)

If the object, advantageous to both faculty and students, is exchange and discussion of views, then more formal means will also be necessary. If the matter is taken in earnest, and a real effort made to secure and consider representative viewpoints, these means will of necessity be elaborate, demanding of time, and occasionally awkward. It must be recognized that the arrangements would be complicated and take a long time to develop and improve. No attempt is made here to present a complete scheme. By way of example only it might be suggested that at the faculty and departmental level, there could be more extensive use of questionnaires; essay contests could produce statements more fully considered and clearly put than questionnaires; and working consultative committees of students, representative of a wide range of student opinion and prepared to study issues in depth, could be

created. The participation thus secured of a large number of students would not only assure governing bodies of more representative and considered views, but would afford a greater number of students insight into the academic issues discussed.

Assuming that, for reasons given elsewhere, parity is not accepted, and student membership on governing bodies is limited to a minority representation, it appears that the student members could not be effective or representative spokesmen for the broad spectrum of graduate and undergraduate opinion. Moreover, even if parity were established, it is impossible to believe that the ordinary individual student would feel the institution more sympathetic or responsive to his needs and opinions merely because, along with 400 or so other students, he has "his" representative on General Faculties Council. Surely anyone who holds the view that student discontent will be contained, or improvement of unsatisfactory conditions readily achieved, merely by increased student membership of the Council clings to a frail reed indeed. Even if the University were to decide to admit more students to its decision-making bodies, it would still be necessary to develop the supplementary arrangements, formal and informal, just described. The University should now address itself to finding effective solutions to the real problems of communication and confidence, and seek no illusory panacea in arrangements to which, on principle, there are such cogent objections.

**(4) The majority report by implication minimizes the effectiveness of current student representation and exaggerates differences of view between students and faculty**

When Students' Union representatives regularly exercised their right to participate in General Faculties Council, and came prepared, their views were paid very close attention and were often adopted. Moreover, the formal presence of student representatives provided a continuing reminder to the Council that student opinion was to be considered in fashioning policy. This representation therefore was "meaningful" (whatever that means!) and it is not accurate to suggest it is merely "token" and leaves students without the means "to influence the important decisions the General Faculties Council must make."

An unfortunate feature that frequently attends the demand for "parity" is the presupposition not only of equality between students and faculty, but of the antagonism of their views. Underlying this, it would appear, is some conception that all that is in issue is a claim to power. It is obvious that academic staff and students will often

view matters in different aspects or differ in their judgment as to which are the most important elements to be considered in deciding certain issues. However, it is simply not true that faculty members of the Council represent only the interests of academic staff; they are elected to represent faculties (including students) and charged to exercise their mature and independent judgment in the interests of the University as a whole. Nor is it demonstrable that their views generally diverge from those of students on matters of common concern or that they are indifferent to student interests; the debates this past year on the Remembrance Day holiday and on the use of consolidated examinations illustrate the point.

#### **(5) Conflict of interest**

It is submitted that it is wrong in principle that students, whose academic performance is to be judged, should sit as voting members of the bodies responsible for determining the means and standards by which they are to be assessed. There is a clear conflict of interest inherent which is a threat to the academic standards of the University. This is particularly true at the level of faculties and departments (which, it is predicted, will virtually be compelled to reconstitute their councils and committees on the same principles adopted by the Council to determine its composition).

#### **PRACTICAL OBJECTIONS TO THE MAJORITY PROPOSAL**

There are serious practical objections to the enlargement of student representation on General Faculties Council proposed by the majority report. Though briefly stated here, these are among the most important criticisms of the majority's views.

(1) As previously noted, there will be more rapid changes in membership resulting from student participation. This may have two effects:  
(a) to disturb the continuity of policy that is essential to the development of the University;  
(b) to waste time, by the unnecessary repetition and review of previous debates, at the behest of new members unfamiliar with earlier developments.

(2) A body of 127 members, as is proposed, is far too large to act efficiently (by which is meant, not only expeditiously, but thoroughly and responsibly). This is a matter of concern, because even now the Council is perhaps too large to be readily convened and to consider as fully as it ought the important matters it has to decide. Matters of great importance—such as

budget and building priorities—have virtually been handed over for decision to smaller continuing committees that can meet regularly and consider problems in depth. The Council has also failed to develop means—corresponding to the parliamentary devices of the Question Period and the private member's motion “to call attention” to some general issue—to render the administration more fully responsible to the representative elected body. (All that the majority report states on this point is, “The Committee was also aware of the possible disadvantages inherent in a much enlarged General Faculties Council, but felt that other considerations, including urgency, outweighed them at this time.”)

(3) One consequence of the inefficiency of the Council resulting from rapidly-changing membership and excessive size, which should be noted by the AASUA and the student body, may be to make the administration more powerful, independent, and, in the literal sense of the word, irresponsible. This would be inconsistent with the underlying premises of the reformed Universities Act.

(4) One further consequence of the proposed enlargement of the General Faculties Council will be to make the voice of any particular faculty or school, particularly a small one, even weaker and less effective than at present.

#### **A SPECIAL NOTE—THE POTENTIALLY AWKWARD POSITION OF THE STUDENTS' UNION**

The granting of parity to students, in the form and manner suggested by the majority report, raises troubling questions about the future role of the Students' Union, at a time when some of its leaders hope it will take on a more active role of a political character.

(1) If parity or a much enlarged student representation is assured, and if this is justified on alleged democratic principles, then it may be asked what justification there is, in terms of democratic principle, once direct student representation on governing bodies is established, for enforcing compulsory membership in the Students' Union. Should it not be only a society which students are free to join or to refuse to support and join, as they may choose?

(2) But even if compulsory membership is enforced, with or without justification, what happens, once direct student representation of students on General Faculties Council is established, to the claim of the Students' Union to represent student opinion to the University authorities?

The representatives of both students'

associations who appeared before the Committee were alive to at least the latter issue. Their proposal was that the elected members of their councils should also be the student members of General Faculties Council. To the suggestion that this would create a “bloc” or “caucus” of delegated or mandated Council members, inconsistent with the traditional principle that each member is free to vote as he sees fit, and not liable to impeachment by those who elected him, the Students' Union responded that their constitution provided for dismissal of student councillors only for unexcused absences from meetings. Therefore, they said, there was no effective way for Student Council to discipline or control one of its members who, in his proposed second capacity as a member of General Faculties Council, refused to vote as a majority of Student Council desired him or directed him to do.

The Committee rejects this position. In their view, there would still be a considerable risk of student members, if they were also Student Union councillors, holding advance meetings and voting *en bloc* in the Council. Moreover, the Committee believed students should be able to elect members of the Council directly, it being quite possible they would seek different qualities or qualifications in Council representatives than in student councillors. Also, in view of the workload of members of the General Faculties Council and of Students' Council, it was felt that a student unable to take on both burdens should not be precluded from assuming one of them.

Accordingly, the majority report (which, on this point, represents the view also of the dissenting member of the Committee) re-affirmed the principle that “every member of General Faculties Council is charged with the responsibility of examining issues before the Council and voting as he or she judges fit on such issues. No member of General Faculties Council, no matter how he or she gains membership on this Council, is an instructed delegate, and no member of General Faculties Council can be impeached.” Further, the Committee specifically states, “the student body should be free to elect any student of their choice to membership on General Faculties Council, and an obligation to serve also in the Council of the Students' Union should not be imposed on students interested in the work of General Faculties Council. If students are interested in such a two-fold obligation, they should be free to run in the election for both positions.”

If, contrary to the recommendations of this paper, student membership of the Council is enlarged, these are sound

principles and should be adopted.

However, it is suggested that as an mention, or recommend safeguards against, a particular strategem that could frustrate these principles. It was frankly acknowledged to the Committee by the Students' Union representatives, that if Student Council members were not also made General Faculties Council members, then the Students' Union might seek to change its constitution to provide that those students who are members of General Faculties Council shall constitute also the Council of the Students' Union. Means should be found to prevent such a measure, as it could frustrate the sound general principles proposed by the Committee.

Moreover, it is suggested that if student membership on General Faculties Council and other bodies is increased as proposed by the majority, the first question mentioned above, that of compulsory Students' Union membership and levy of fees, must also be treated as open to review and debate.

#### **THE OUTLINE OF AN ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL**

(1) *It is recommended that for the reasons stated above, the majority report, and its recommendations, should be rejected by General Faculties Council.*

(2) It is a fact that General Faculties Council and the Board of Governors have already extended full voting membership to nominees of the Students' Union and the Graduate Students' Association. There is a good argument in favor of this limited representation: it is difficult, in a university as large as this, to assure communication and representation of student opinion except by giving some students guaranteed places on governing bodies. Two considerations might seem to justify the expansion of this representation to some degree: first, the very heavy workload borne by the current student members, who have other obligations, could be distributed more generally, with a corresponding improvement in the students' contribution to the discussion of the diverse issues coming before the Council; second, if the number of student members were increased and some appropriate method for the direct election of students were found, there would be less danger of student members being pressured to act as mandated delegates of the Students' Union Council or any other grouping, and greater freedom for them to act, as other members of General Faculties Council should and do act, as representative but independent councillors.

*It is, however, submitted that attractive and plausible as this more moderate suggestion (which is a proposal only for a limited increase in the number of student members and a change in the method of their selection) may appear, it also should be rejected. The true solution to the problems of the free exchange of views between decision-making bodies and students lies in a complex of other measures; formal and informal. Equally important, in the light of the extreme demands of some segments of the University population for student power and parity, it is likely to prove impossible to expand student membership to some degree and then call halt at a defensible point. Such a change would soon be misrepresented as a partial but incomplete recognition of the claims that students are equally as competent as faculty to determine academic policy and that "democracy" requires parity; and there would soon be further and more extreme demands on these bases for parity. The answer is not to yield now to such anticipated pressures. It is, instead, to insist—rationally, civilly, and firmly—on the important distinctions between academic and non-academic matters, the qualified and the unqualified, representation and decision; and at the same time, diligently and in good faith, to develop the difficult and expensive, but ultimately the only effective and valid, measures that are needed to resolve the real problems of student participation in the development and reform of their University education.*

(3) To develop such measures will take the best and most dedicated efforts of a large number of students and faculty at the University, the faculty, and the departmental levels. It would be premature, indeed impossible, to propose now a scheme of general application and usefulness.

*However, it is suggested that as an alternative to the majority proposal, General Faculties Council should take steps to develop functional improvements of the formal and informal means for the representation and serious consideration of student opinion, and the exchange of views between students and decision-making bodies, bearing in mind that the patterns for sharing authority and responsibility between senior and junior members of the University will vary according to the character of the subject-matter to be considered by the various decision-making and administrative bodies concerned.*

An incomplete and insufficiently precise but nonetheless useful preliminary outline of some areas of responsibility to which different arrangements might be appropriate

is provided in the October 1968 Joint Statement of the English Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals and the National Union of Students: "The National Union of Students seeks effective student presence on all relevant committees. Our discussions identified three broad areas of operation of such committees: (a) the whole field of student welfare—for example health services, catering facilities, and the provision of accommodation—where there should in our view be varying degrees of participation of students in the decision-making process. Apart from this, there is the area which covers, for example, the operation of student unions and the management of a wide range of extracurricular activities, in which most university student organizations rightly have long had complete responsibility, (b) that relating for example to curriculum and courses, teaching methods, major organizational matters, and issues concerning the planning and development of the university—where the ultimate decision must be that of the statutorily responsible body. In this area, we would regard it as essential that students' views should be properly taken into account, and (c) that involving for example decisions on appointments, promotions and other matters affecting the personal position of members of staff, the admissions of individuals and their academic assessment—where student presence would be inappropriate. Students should, however, have opportunities to discuss the general principles involved in such decisions and have their views properly considered."

#### **POSTSCRIPT**

The writer is uncomfortably aware that the subject under review is controversial and apt to engender strong feelings. It is a matter of regret to him that his views should be so markedly at variance with those of his distinguished colleagues on the Committee, and would be most unhappy if his expression of a contrary view should give them, or others, offence. However, in a matter of such grave and lasting significance in the University, he has thought it obligatory to expose and criticize what he regards as wrong in the majority report and its underlying assumptions, and to present with some force (perhaps, indeed, too curtly) an alternative view. It is hoped that this contrast of opinions may contribute to the thorough study of the question by all members of the University.

## The Universities Act

The following excerpts are from The Universities Act, with amendments to 1970.

**32.** For each university there shall be a general faculties council consisting of

- (a) the following *ex officio* members,
  - (i) the president, who shall be chairman,
  - (ii) the vice-presidents,
  - (iii) the dean of each faculty,
  - (iv) the director of each school,
  - (v) the chief librarian,
  - (vi) the director of extension, or if none, the officer exercising comparable functions, and
  - (vii) the registrar,
- (b) the elected members representing the faculties and the schools that have school councils, and
- (b1) the following student members,
  - (i) two students nominated by the council of the students' union, and
  - (ii) if there is a graduate students' association, one student nominated by the council of the association, and
- (c) the appointed members.

**33.**

(3) On the direction, from time to time, of the general faculties council the registrar

- (a) shall establish the total number of elected members there is to be on the council, which shall be twice the number of *ex officio* members, and
- (b) shall determine the number of members that may be elected by each faculty or school, which, so far as is reasonably possible, shall be in the same proportion to the total number of elected members as the number of full-time members of the academic staff of the faculty or school is to the total number of full-time members of the academic staff of all the faculties and schools.

(4) The *ex officio*, elected and student members shall appoint the appointed members of the general faculties council from the staff of the university, in such number and for such terms of office as the *ex officio*, elected and student members determine.

## PEOPLE

■ HARRY E. GUNNING, Chairman of the Department of Chemistry, has been elected a Fellow of the New York Academy of Sciences.

■ KAROL KROTKI, Professor of Sociology, took part in a seminar organized by three French institutions in Paris: l'Office de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique Outre-Mer; l'Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques; and l'Institut National d'Etudes Demographiques. Its purpose was the production and evaluation of a manual on the taking and analysis of social surveys in Francophone African countries. Dr. Krotki, who has been working on an enumeration technique for the last few years with professional colleagues in the United States and other countries, was invited to present a paper. He also chaired a session on the interrelationship of demographic and economic variables.

■ W. T. FAGAN, Associate Professor of Elementary Education, has had his doctoral dissertation recognized by the National Council of Teachers of English as one of six outstanding pieces of research completed in the field of English education during the past year. His thesis supervisor was MARION E. D. JENKINSON, Professor of Elementary Education. Dr. Fagan and the other five award winners will form a research committee in their field of study. They will be honored, too, at the annual convention of the NCTE to be held in Atlanta, Georgia.

## PERSONAL NOTICES

*Notices must reach the Editor by 9 a.m. the Friday prior to publication. They must be typed, and not exceed 35 words including heading.*

### Accommodation Available

FOR SALE—Home, 1,550 sq. ft.; four bedrooms, seven different built-ins, 200 feet of wrought-iron fencing, huge patio and double paved garage. 6 1/4 per cent mortgage: \$129 I.P.T. \$31,500. 434-1778.

FOR RENT—Two rooms, use of bath and kitchen, full house privileges, close to University. Staff or graduate students preferred. Available January 1. \$75 per month. 432-8084.

FOR SALE—Three-bedroom bungalow, Belgravia. Across the street from school and bus. Beautifully landscaped yard. Garage. Rumpus room, den, extra bedroom in basement. Possession first week January. Apply 11627-73 Avenue.

TO SHARE—House with three others, own room, fully furnished, garage. \$70 per month, eight blocks from University. 433-5947 evenings.

FOR SALE—Split level home in Westbrook Estates. Six bedrooms (four upstairs, two in finished basement), three washrooms, large family room with fireplace, dinette, double attached garage, landscaped, fenced. 434-7933 after 6 p.m. No agents.

FOR RENT—Furnished home in Laurier Park, fifteen minutes from University. Carpeted kitchen, dishwasher, two ovens, all appliances; two

fireplaces, two-car garage. Available January 1 to June 30, 1971. Rent negotiable. 488-3718.

TO SUBLT—Fully-furnished highrise apartment, two bedrooms, pool, sauna, covered parking, near University. Two to four months beginning January. Monthly rate, all inclusive, \$250. 439-7064.

### Automobiles and Accessories

FOR SALE—1967 Cutlass Supreme, V-8, automatic, 2-door, hardtop, power steering and brakes. 44,000 miles, new tires plus snow tires, radio, excellent condition. 435-1802.

FOR SALE—1969 Renault-16, under 14,000 miles, excellent condition, one owner, \$2,100 or best offer. Ray, 432-3268, or 433-4558.

FOR SALE—1966 Austin Mini (Red), fully weatherized, new tires, padded dash, roof rack, head rest, 45mpg, no oil consumption, \$550. Unique in Canada. Must sell. 215 J Michener Park. 435-1548.

FOR SALE—Michelin Radial Tires, almost new, size 165/15. 488-5172 after 5 p.m.

### Goods and Services

FOR SALE—Red European hair wig (uncut) \$35; two maple school desks (elementary size) \$10 each; beautiful six-string guitar, \$35. 434-1778.

WANTED—Electric samovar in good condition. Call Lee Roth 432-5514.

FOR SALE—Men's ski boots size 9 and skates size 8. Large tri-light lamp and crockery. Also various items of ladies' clothing, size 12-14. 488-5172 after 5 p.m.

WANTED—One office desk and chair for Varsity Christian Fellowship Office. Prefer low rent or loan basis. 432-5868 between 12 and 5 p.m.

FOR SALE—Paoli Accordion with case, almost new (owner deceased). 434-3354 after 4:30 p.m.

FOR SALE—Livingroom drapes, fibreglass, lined, orange, size 144 in. x 84 in.; Bedroom drapes, Dacron, lined, flowered, size 80 in. x 60 in. (like new); Bedspread, double-bed size, white chenille (like new). 433-2351.

FOR SALE—Champion sired Kerry Blue puppies—the elegant dog with a sense of humor, spirited but sensible, alert guardian, lovely with children, no shedding, no doggy odor. 434-2047 anytime after 3 p.m.

FOR SALE—Potted chrysanthemums, florist quality. Yellow, pink or bronze for Christmas season. Fresh, long lasting blooms. 699-5135 evenings and weekends.

FOR SALE—One pair men's hockey skates and one pair men's figure skates, both size 12. 432-7729 after 6 p.m.

## POSITIONS VACANT

### NON-ACADEMIC STAFF

*Applicants are sought for the following positions. The Personnel Office (Room 121, Administration Building) will provide further details to interested persons, who are asked not to approach the departments directly.*

Clerk Typist II (\$302-\$368)—Housing and Food Services; Sociology; Slavic Languages and Comparative Literature; Student Health Services

Clerk Steno II (\$317-\$386)—Mathematics, Business Administration and Commerce

Bookkeeper II (\$368-\$447)—Student Health Services

Clerk Steno III (P/T)—Chemistry

Analyst (\$803-\$976)—Administrative Data Processing

Electronics Technician II (\$571-\$693)—Electrical Engineering

Chemical Technician I (\$470-\$571)—Animal Science

Bacteriology Technologist I (\$470-\$571)—

Provincial Laboratory

Programmer III (\$693-\$843)—Administrative Data Processing

Graphics Assistant (Open)—Technical Services

## THIS WEEK AND NEXT

### 4 DECEMBER, FRIDAY

Television workshop

1 p.m. Art Department workshop. Those interested in attending should call W. G. BURLEY, 432-4962. Television Studio, Basement, Centre Wing, Biological Sciences Centre.

Seminar-in-the-round

2 p.m. J. R. ROYCE, Director of the Theoretical Psychology Centre, will present the topic "What Factor Analysis Can and Cannot Do." Room 14-6, Henry Marshall Tory Building.

Student cinema

7 and 9:30 p.m. *Head* with SONNY LISTON. SUB Theatre. Admission 50 cents.

Hockey

8 p.m. Golden Bears vs. the University of British Columbia. Varsity Arena.

Chamber music

8:30 p.m. The St. Cecilia Chamber Orchestra of the Department of Music, conducted by MICHAEL BOWIE, Assistant Professor of Music, with CATHERINE VICKERS, piano soloist. Convocation Hall. Admission free.

### 5 DECEMBER, SATURDAY

Edmonton Symphony

8:30 p.m. Also December 6 at 3 p.m. Beethoven Centennial Concert. ANTON KUERTI, pianist. Piano Concerto 2 in Bb; Symphony 8 in F; Piano Concerto 4 in G. Jubilee Auditorium.

### 6 DECEMBER, SUNDAY

Band concert

3 p.m. University of Alberta Concert Band, conducted by JOHN ILTIS, Associate Professor of Music. SUB Theatre. Tickets at the door.

Student cinema

7 and 9:30 p.m. *Warrendale*, a documentary. SUB Theatre. Admission 50 cents.

### 7 DECEMBER, MONDAY

SUB Art Gallery

"Alberta Artists" series. An exhibition of prints by J. KNOWLTON and R. SYLVESTER.

Edmonton Film Society

8:15 p.m. *Mississippi Mermaid*, directed by FRANCOIS TRUFFAUT. Set in America, it stars CATHERINE DENEUVE and JEAN-PAUL BELMONDO. Main Series. Jubilee Auditorium.

### 8 DECEMBER, TUESDAY

Boreal Circle

8 p.m. RICHARD ROHMER, DFC, QC, President of the Mid-Canada Development Foundation Inc., Toronto, will talk on "Mid-Canada: the Boreal Forest and a National Purpose for Canada." Everyone welcome; refreshments will be served. Room 129, Education Building.

### 9 DECEMBER, WEDNESDAY

Hunger lunch

Noon. Hunger lunch and collection for the Canadian Save the Children Fund.

Computing Science colloquium

4 p.m. D. G. FISHER, Department of Chemical and Petroleum Engineering. "Real-time Computers and their Applications." Room 611, General Services Building.

Public lecture

8 p.m. ARTHUR MANDEL of Berkeley. "The Jews of Eastern Europe in the 20th Century: Aims and Aspirations." Room T-1-91, Henry Marshall Tory Building.

Citadel Theatre

Opening night of *The Secretary Bird* by WILLIAM DOUGLAS-HOME. With HENRY COMOR and JILL SHOWELL.

### 10 DECEMBER, THURSDAY

Student theatre

Until December 19. 8:30 p.m. evenings, 2:30 Saturday. *The Plow and the Stars* by SEAN O'CASEY, directed by MARK SCHOENBERG, Assistant Professor of Drama.

### 11 DECEMBER, FRIDAY

Student cinema

7 and 9:30 p.m. *Bullitt* with STEVE MC QUEEN. SUB Theatre. Admission 50 cents.

String quartet

8:30 p.m. The University of Alberta String Quartet with THOMAS ROLSTON and LAWRENCE FISHER, violins; MICHAEL BOWIE, viola; CLAUDE KENNESON, violoncello. Convocation Hall. Admission free.

### 12 DECEMBER, SATURDAY

Audubon wildlife film

8 p.m. ROBERT E. FULTZ'S *Acadian Reflections*, filmed in Acadia National Park, Maine. Creatures of land and sea are shown in their natural environment, and special effects photography creates a psychedelic effect from the natural movements of color and reflections. Room P126 Physics Building.

### 13 DECEMBER, SUNDAY

Christmas concert

3 p.m. Assorted vocal and instrumental ensembles will perform. Carol singing for all. Directed by DAVID STOCKER, Assistant Professor of Music. Convocation Hall. Admission free.

### 14 DECEMBER, MONDAY

Edmonton Film Society

7:30 p.m. Double feature. *The Thief of Baghdad* (1924) directed by RAOUL WALSH, with DOUGLAS FAIRBANKS; and *Meet Me in St. Louis* (1944) directed by VINCENTE MINELLI, with JUDY GARLAND. Classic series. Room TL 11, Henry Marshall Tory Building

### EXHIBITIONS

The Art Gallery and Museum

Until December 15. "From Reality: Five Vancouver Artists." Hours: Monday and Friday 12:30 to 4:30 p.m., Wednesday 11 a.m. to 7 p.m., Tuesdays and Thursdays 12:30 to 5:15 p.m. Closed on Sundays.

The tropical displayhouse

Numerous plants in blossom. The most outstanding are the red powderpuff (*calliandra*) and the cotton which is still puffing. The bananas will be ripening until Christmas.

Listings must reach the Editor by 9 a.m. the Friday prior to publication. Written notification is preferred. Compiled by NORMA GUTTERIDGE, 432-4991.